



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

80
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,014	10/18/2001	John Y. Wang	2291P	7455
23464	7590	05/19/2005	EXAMINER	
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL, P.C. ONE OXFORD CENTRE, 301 GRANT STREET 20TH FLOOR PITTSBURGH, PA 15219				STORK, KYLE R
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2178		

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/004,014	WANG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kyle R Stork	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 25.4.05, 31.1.05, 07.3.05

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non-final office action is in response to the amendment filed 7 March 2005, and the information disclosure statements filed 31 January 2005, 7 March 2005, 24 March 2005, and 25 April 2005.
2. Claims 1-52 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 18, 24, 28, 37, 44, and 49 are independent claims. The rejections of claims 1-27 under 35 USC 103 under the combinations of Bracewell et al. (US 2002/0103858, hereafter Bracewell), Motoyama (US 2004/0162750), and Lemay ("Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 in 14 days, 1997) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statements (IDS) are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
5. Claims 1-9 and 28-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in

the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The applicant fails to disclose the limitation of “storing the layout template and the content as database records **separate from the web page database record;**” as claimed in claims 1 and 28 (emphasis added).

Claims 2-9 and 29-36 are rejected based upon their dependency upon rejected base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-2 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lloyd (US 6460041, filed 25 April 2001).

As per independent claim 1, Lloyd discloses a method for constructing a database driven website (column 8, lines 28-40), the website comprising a plurality of web pages, the method comprising the steps of:

- Storing at least one web page as a database record having fields that reference a layout template and content (Figures 5-6; column 9, lines 35-57; column 5, lines 40-65: Here, a database is capable of storing web pages. These web

pages, contain a reference to web page data stored in a location within the database. This data can be a template, which is further processed to integrate content into the web page for display).

- Storing the layout template and the content as database records separate from the web page database record (Figure 5)
- Displaying each web page stored as a database record by using the fields in the corresponding web page database record to access the layout template and content database records for display (Figures 5-6; column 9, lines 35-57; column 5, lines 40-65)

As per dependent claim 2, Lloyd discloses the step of allowing a user to specify a page-type for each web page stored as a database record from among a plurality of page types (column 8, lines 48-62: Here, pages types are based upon a user's ability to modify the pages. A user can specify access levels granted to registered users.

Registered users may be allowed to alter the data (web page) stored within the database, while an anonymous user would be able to view information associated with the web page, but would be unable to modify the data).

As per independent claim 28, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 29, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 3 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd.

As per dependent claim 3, Lloyd discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 2. However, Lloyd fails to specifically disclose the method further comprising the step of storing the specified page type as a field in the corresponding database record for the web page. However, Lloyd discloses storing web pages, data, tables, forms, reports, user profiles, and other data in a database (Figure 6, item 80).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd's method of allowing a user to specify a page type with Lloyd's method of storing data in a web page, since it would have allowed a user to access all data related to a web page.

As per dependent claim 30, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

10. Claims 4-6, 10, 15-17, 31-33, 37, and 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd as in further view of Cohen (US 6263352, filed 14 November 1997).

As per dependent claim 4, Lloyd discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd fails to specifically disclose providing an application object for each page for processing web pages. However, Cohen discloses providing an application object for each page for processing web pages (column 4, lines 42-53: Here, an active server page and an active server application are used to process web pages).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd's method with Cohen's method, since it would have allowed a user to generate pages through a template (Cohen: column 4, lines 42-53).

As per dependent claim 5, Lloyd and Cohen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Cohen further discloses the method comprising invoking the application object to display the web page (column 4, line 54- column 5, line 64: Here, the process of displaying a web page generated from an active server template (AST) is disclosed).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd and Cohen's method with Cohen's method, since it would have allowed a user the ability to generate several web pages while only creating one AST (column 4, lines 42-54).

As per dependent claim 6, Lloyd and Cohen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 5, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd discloses the use

of templates to generate content page-types (column 5, lines 43-65). Cohen further discloses application page-types (column 4, lines 42-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd and Cohen's method with Cohen's method, since it would have allowed a user to generate several web pages from either a content or application template.

As per independent claim 10, Lloyd discloses a method for constructing a database-driven website, the website comprising a plurality of web pages, the method comprising the steps of:

- Allowing a user to create one or more web pages for a website by specifying parameters for one or more web pages, wherein the parameters include the page-type of the web page, and content to be displayed in the web page (Figures 5-6; column 9, lines 35-57; column 5, lines 40-65)
- Storing the one or more web pages as a database record (Figure 5)
- Displaying one of the one or more web pages on a computer by invoking the application object corresponding to the page type field in the corresponding web page data record to present the corresponding content to the client computer (Figures 5-6; column 9, lines 35-57; column 5, lines 40-65)

However, Lloyd fails to specifically disclose:

- Providing a plurality of application objects corresponding to a plurality of page-types for processing web pages corresponding to the page-types when invoked

Cohen discloses:

- Providing a plurality of application objects corresponding to a plurality of page-types for processing web pages corresponding to the page-types when invoked (column 4, line 42- column 5, line 64)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd's method with Cohen's method, since it would have allowed a user to generate several web pages from either a content or application template.

As per dependent claim 15, Lloyd and Cohen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd further discloses the method further comprising the step of allowing a user to specify content for the one or more web pages both during and after specifying the parameters for the one or more web pages (column 8, lines 28-40 and 48-62: Here, a user can edit the parameters for a page while the page is being created. Further, some users are granted permissions to edit parameters of the web page after the web page has been created).

As per dependent claim 16, Lloyd and Cohen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd further discloses the method further comprising the step of providing a software tool for allowing a user to construct the website (column 8, lines 28-40).

As per dependent claim 17, Lloyd and Cohen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 16, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd further discloses the method further comprising the step of implementing the software tool as a web

application running on a server that allows a user to construct a website using a web browser (column 8, lines 28-62).

As per dependent claim 31, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 32, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 5, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 33, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per independent claim 37, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 42, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 43, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 17, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

11. Claims 7-9, 24, 34-36, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd as in further view of Lemay.

As per dependent claim 7, Lloyd discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd discloses the use of templates for generating web pages (Figures 5-6; column 9, lines 35-57; column 5, lines 40-65). However, Lloyd fails to specifically disclose locations for one or more navigational link areas that display navigational links for the website. However, Lemay discloses web

pages containing locations for one or more navigational link areas that display navigational links for the website (pages 401 and 411-414: Here, the use of frames is disclosed. These frames are capable of containing hyperlinks for navigation of a web page. One example of this is shown in Figure 14.15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd's method with Lemay's method, since it would have allowed a user to generate several web pages containing links to other web resources.

As per dependent claim 8, Lloyd and Lemay disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 7, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd discloses a database for storing data (Figures 5-6). Lemay further discloses parameters specifying a title for a web page, a layout template for a web page, and a link location that defines where a link for the current web page will be displayed, wherein the parameters are stored as fields (pages 401 and 414: Here, tags are fields. The <TITLE> tag (page 401) has a value of "Page Title." Further, a template specifying documents to be linked to frame information to be inserted is disclosed (page 414). Finally, the link location is specified by the anchor tag used for links. The link is then displayed within the page relative to the anchor tag).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd and Lemay's method with Lemay's method, since it would have allowed a user to store web page data within a database.

As per dependent claim 9, Lloyd and Lemay disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 8, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lemay further discloses the method comprising defining in each link location a field, whether the link for a corresponding web page will appear in the navigational areas displayed on every page, or that the corresponding web page is a sub-page of a parent web page, in which case the link for the corresponding web page may appear only when the parent page is displayed (page 415, table 14.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd and Lemay's method with Lemay's method, since it would have allowed a user to easily specify how pages will be displayed.

As per independent claim 24, Lloyd discloses a method for constructing a website that includes a plurality of web pages, the method comprising the steps of:

- Allowing user selection (column 8, lines 28-62)
 - Allowing the user to specify parameters for each web page (Figures 5-6; column 9, lines 35-57; column 5, lines 40-65; column 8, lines 28-62)
 - Storing each of the web pages as a database record and storing the corresponding parameters (Figures 5-6)

Lloyd fails to specifically disclose:

- A layout template that defines a homepage and navigational areas on the top-level web pages for displaying navigational links

- For each top-level web pages, wherein the link location defines either which navigational area a link to the corresponding top-level web page will be displayed, or that the corresponding top-level web page is a sub-page of a parent top-level page, such that the link for the corresponding top-level page will appear only when the parent top-level web page is displayed

However, Lemay discloses:

- A layout template that defines a homepage and navigational areas on the top-level web pages for displaying navigational links (pages 33-43, 401, and 411-414: Here, creating a web page hierarchy is disclosed. Further, frames for displaying navigational links are disclosed)
- For each top-level web pages, wherein the link location defines either which navigational area a link to the corresponding top-level web page will be displayed, or that the corresponding top-level web page is a sub-page of a parent top-level page, such that the link for the corresponding top-level page will appear only when the parent top-level web page is displayed (page 415, table 14.2)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd's method with Lemay's method, since it would have allowed a user to easily specify how pages will be displayed.

As per dependent claim 34, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 35, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 8, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 36, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per independent claim 49, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 24, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

12. Claims 11-14, 18-23, 38-41, and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd and Cohen as in further view of Lemay.

As per dependent claim 11, Lloyd and Cohen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd further discloses the method of providing a plurality of layout templates stored in a database (Figures 5-6; column 9, lines 35-57; column 5, lines 40-65). Lloyd and Cohen fail to specifically disclose the method of defining locations of navigational areas that display navigational links on web pages. However, Lemay discloses the method of defining locations of navigational areas that display navigational links on web pages (pages 401 and 411-414).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd's method with Lemay's method, since it would have allowed a user to generate several web pages containing links to other web resources.

As per dependent claim 12, Lloyd, Cohen, and Lemay disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lemay further discloses the method further comprising allowing a user to specify a link location for the one or more web pages, the link location stored as a field in the corresponding web page database record and defining a navigational area within the corresponding layout where a link will be displayed (pages 401 and 414).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd, Cohen, and Lemay's method with Lemay's method, since it would have allowed a user to store web page data within a database.

As per dependent claim 13, Lloyd, Cohen, and Lemay disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 12, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lemay further discloses the method of displaying links to other web pages on the web page being displayed (page 39: Here, links allow for navigation between two web pages).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd, Cohen, and Lemay's method with Lemay's method, since it would have allowed a user to navigate between pages on the internet.

As per dependent claim 14, Lloyd, Cohen, and Lemay disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lemay further discloses the method comprising the step of defining in each link location, whether the link for the corresponding web page will appear in the navigational area

displayed on every page or that the corresponding web page is a sub-page of a parent web page, in which case the link for the corresponding web page will only appear when the parent web page is displayed (page 415, table 14.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd and Lemay's method with Lemay's method, since it would have allowed a user to easily specify how pages will be displayed.

As per independent claim 18, Lloyd discloses a method for providing database-driven web pages, the method comprising the steps of:

- Storing each of the web pages as a database record that includes fields for storing parameters (Figure 5)
- Displaying each web page by accessing the database record for the corresponding web page, and invoking the application object corresponding to the specified page type in the corresponding web page database record to display the corresponding web page according to the specified layout (Figures 5-6; column 9, lines 35-57; column 5, lines 40-65)

Lloyd fails to specifically disclose:

- Defining locations of navigational areas that display navigational links on web pages
- Providing a plurality of page types defining different types of web pages, wherein each page type corresponds to an application object for processing a web page of that particular web page

- Allowing a user to define an organizational hierarchy for a website by specifying parameters for each of the web pages, wherein the parameters include the layout template for the web page, a title for the web page, the page type for the web page, and a link location that defines a navigational area with the corresponding layout template where a link to the web page will be displayed

However, Cohen discloses:

- Providing a plurality of page types defining different types of web pages, wherein each page type corresponds to an application object for processing a web page of that particular web page (column 4, lines 42-53)

Lemay discloses:

- Defining locations of navigational areas that display navigational links on web pages (pages 401 and 411-414)
- Allowing a user to define an organizational hierarchy for a website by specifying parameters for each of the web pages, wherein the parameters include the layout template for the web page, a title for the web page, the page type for the web page, and a link location that defines a navigational area with the corresponding layout template where a link to the web page will be displayed (pages 401 and 414-415; table 14.2)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd's method with Cohen's method and Lemay's method, since it would have allowed a user easily define a link locations for a database driven website.

As per dependent claim 19, Lloyd, Cohen, and Lemay disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 18, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lemay further discloses the method comprising the step of defining in each link location, whether the link for the corresponding web page will appear in the navigational area displayed on every page or that the corresponding web page is a sub-page of a parent web page, in which case the link for the corresponding web page will only appear when the parent web page is displayed (page 415, table 14.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd and Lemay's method with Lemay's method, since it would have allowed a user to easily specify how pages will be displayed.

As per dependent claim 20, Lloyd, Cohen, and Lemay disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 19, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd further discloses the method of allowing a user to specify content for each of the web pages, and storing content as a database record, wherein each web page database record includes a field referencing a content database record for the corresponding web page (column 8, lines 28-62; Figures 5-6).

As per dependent claim 21, Lloyd, Cohen, and Lemay disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 20, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd discloses allowing a user to specify content both during and after creation of a website (column 8, lines 28-40 and 48-62).

As per dependent claim 22, Lloyd, Cohen, and Lemay disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd further discloses the method further comprising the step of providing a software tool for allowing a user to construct the website (column 8, lines 28-40).

As per dependent claim 23, Lloyd, Cohen, and Lemay disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 22, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd further discloses the method further comprising the step of implement the software tool as a web application running on a server that allows a user to construct a website using a web browser (column 8, lines 28-62).

As per dependent claim 38, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 39, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 40, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 41, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 14, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per independent claim 44, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 18, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 45, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 19, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 46, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 20, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 47, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 48, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 23, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

13. Claims 25-27 and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd and Lemay in further view of Cohen.

As per dependent claim 25, Lloyd and Lemay disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 24, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd discloses content for web pages (Lloyd and Lemay fail to specifically discloses the method wherein parameters compromise a page type and content for web pages. However, Cohen discloses the method wherein parameters compromise a page type and content for web pages (column 4, lines 42-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd and Lemay's method with Cohen's method, since it would have allowed a user to specify several templates and content for the templates.

As per dependent claim 26, Lloyd, Lemay, and Cohen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 25, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lloyd further

discloses storing page information in database records, wherein the web page, page type, and content are stored as separate records (Figures 5-6).

As per dependent claim 27, Lloyd, Lemay, and Cohen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 26, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Cohen further discloses the method of providing an application object for each page type (column 4, lines 42-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lloyd, Lemay, and Cohen's method with Cohen's method, since it would have allowed a user to generate pages through a template (Cohen: column 4, lines 42-53).

As per dependent claim 50, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 25, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 51, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 26, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

As per dependent claim 52, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 27, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-52 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As detailed above, the Lloyd and Cohen references have been added to address the applicant's arguments. Further, the applicant's argument that Lemay is directed

toward a prior art method of creating a static webpage is moot when Lemay is combined with the Lloyd and Cohen references.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Giroux (US 6289347): Discloses data processing using web forms.
- Lee et al. (US 6466970): Discloses collecting and analyzing information in a networked environment.
- Nakatsuyama et al. (US 5802529): Discloses database management for a plurality of document structures.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs

Cesar B Paula
CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER